

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 9 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-21 are pending.

### *Allowable subject matter*

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1, 3-7 and 18 are allowed, and that claims 10-12 and 17 contain allowable subject matter.

### *Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 9, 13-16 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,234,646 to Ito et al. ("Ito"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 9 and 19, as amended, each recite "each of the mirror finished surfaces is arranged to follow along and parallel to a segment that connects the light emission source of the light emitting diode to one of boundaries between the reflection surfaces and the mirror finished surfaces." Applicant submits that this arrangement of the mirror finished surfaces to follow along and parallel to the segment recited in claims 9 and 19 was implicit in claims 9 and 19 prior to amendment. Ito fails to disclose at least this feature of claims 9 and 19.

The Office Action equates the LED lamps 2(a), reflection portions 3a, and reflecting portions 3b of Ito, with the light emitting diode, reflection surfaces, and mirror finished surfaces, respectively, as recited in claims 9 and 19. In contrast to the arrangement recited in claims 9 and 19, however, the reflection portions 3b are not arranged to follow along and parallel to a segment that connects the light emission source of the LED lamps 2(a) to one of boundaries between the reflection portions 3a and the reflecting portions 3b. A segment from the light emission source of the LED lamp 2(a) to the boundary between the reflection portions 3a and the reflecting portions 3b would be a straight line from the source in the LED

lamp 2(a) to a boundary in the view shown in Fig. 4 of Ito. The reflecting portions 3b, however, do not follow along and parallel to such straight lines from the LED lamp 2(a) as can be seen from the rays drawn in Fig. 4. Thus, Ito fails to anticipate claims 9 or 19.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified the Ito vehicle lamp to arrive at that as claimed in claims 9 and 19. The purpose of the reflecting portions 3b in Ito is to reflect light from the LED lamp 2(b) to outside the vehicle lamp. There is no indication that this purpose would be achieved by modifying the Ito vehicle lamp such that the reflecting portions 3b were arranged to follow along and parallel to the segments as recited in claims 9 and 19.

The Office Action states on pages 8-9, bridging paragraph, "it is noted that the mirror finished surfaces are claimed as arranged on the cited segment, not as being formed by such segment; the reflective portions 3b of ITO et al. could broadly be considered to be arranged on segment connecting the light emission source to one of the boundaries between the reflective portions 3a and 3b, while not formed by such segment." Insofar as this statement suggests that the structure of Ito could have the arrangement of the mirror finished surfaces relative to the segment as recited in claims 9 and 19 merely by the reflective portions 3b of Ito intersecting a line segment from the light emission source of the LED lamp 2(a) to the boundary between the reflection portions 3a and the reflecting portions 3b, applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 9 and 19 have been amended to explicitly require that the mirror finished surfaces are arranged to follow along and parallel to the segment recited in these claims. The mere intersection of the reflective portions 3b of Ito with a segment from the light emission source of the LED lamp 2(a) to the boundary between the reflection portions 3a and the reflecting portions 3b would not meet the limitations of claims 9 and 19.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10-12 and 17.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 30, 2007

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438